NEW SHAKESPEAREANA.

VOL. VI. JANUARY, 1907. No. 1.

AS TO METEORS AND METEORIC SHOWERS; SOME OVERLOOKED ITEMS OF INTEREST IN THE HAMLET AND THE JULIUS CÆSAR.

In the Second Quarto of Hamlet occurs the well-known passage beginning, "I think it be no other but e'en so." (I. i. 108-125.) This passage is not found in either the First Quarto or the Folio. It apparently contains a reference to two astronomical events: first, a meteoric shower, ("as stars with trains of fire and dews of blood,") and second, an eclipse of the moon, (and the moist star . . . was sick almost to dooms day with eclipse.") These references to objective facts have not received the attention or scientific examination they deserve. It is the object of this paper to enquire if there be in these lines allusion to some ascertainable and certain phenomena of the sort; one that Shakespeare himself saw—or could have seen, or heard described as a precusor of fierce events that Heaven was supposed to demonstrate to the countrymen of Prince Hamlet. It will surely be interesting if we can show that just such a meteoric display as the text would require did actually occur in or about the years 1601 or 1602.

The well-known showers of "falling stars" which science knows as occurring about the fifteenth day of November at periods of thirty-two and a quarter years, or a multiple of that periodicity are called "November Showers." They are also called "Leonids," because always appearing to diverge from a point in the constellation Leo. The Leonids differ from any other meteoric display in that they combine, at once, two characteristics, peculiar to them only. First, the shower occurs at an interval of many years, and on a specific date. And secondly, the display is one of the most extraordinary phenomena ever witnessed by the eye of man. The last brilliant display of Leonids in the United States occurred on the early morning of November 13th, 1833. An elaborate account of it is given by Prof. Olmstead in "The American Journal of Science and Arts," for 1834. (Vol. 25, p. 363, and Vol. 26, p. 132.) It is a long paper. I can

give but a few extracts. Prof. Olmstead states:— "Probably no celestial phenomenon has ever occurred in this country which was viewed with so much admiration and delight by one class of spectators, or with so much astonishment and fear by another class." "To furnish some idea of the phenomenon, the reader may imagine a constant succession of fire balls, resembling sky-rockets, radiating in all directions from a point in the heavens,—some were larger than Jupiter or Venus. The flashes of light, although less intense than lightning, were so bright as to awaken people in their beds.— I was surprised at seeing innumerable meteors—falling about half as thick as the flakes of snow in one of our common snowfalls.— Many persons thought a shower of fire was falling, and became exceedingly alarmed.— It could only be compared to one grand and continual discharge of fireworks, occupying the whole visible heavens." There is much more to the same effect, not necessary to quote. But I shall give some extracts illustrative of, first, the line quoted above from Hamlet, and secondly, of several remarkable references in Julius Cæsar to the same display. Julius Cæsar first appeared in print in 1623. I am not concerned, here, in establishing the date of its composition. But I shall present extracts from both tragedies that agree exactly with Olmstead's descriptions. In Hamlet the dramatist speaks of the "stars with trains of fire and dews of blood!" The following are from Olmstead:— "The trains left by the exploding balls were usually of a yellowish hue, but sometimes reddish" (l. c. p. 384)— "The balls, as they travelled down the vault usually left after them a vivid streak of light" (p. 365)—"filled the whole heavens with beautiful, brilliant streams of light" (p. 371)—trains—continuing from 3 to 7 or 8 seconds, and sprinkling the heavens with long, bright dashes of light resembling in their form the marks made on the window by the first drops of a shower driven against the glass ("dews of blood") (p. 376). In Julius Cæsar we find still closer resemblances. These may be classed under five heads. First, general descriptions of the phenomena are given:— "But never till to-night, never till now Did I go through a tempest dropping fire" (I. iii. 9.) "—for now, this fearful night There is no stir or walking in the streets: And the complexion of the element In favour's like the work we have in hand, Most bloody, fiery, and most terrible." (I. iii. 126.) "Fierce, fiery warriors fought upon the clouds, In ranks and squadrons and right form of war, Which drizzled blood upon the Capitol. (II. ii. 19.) "The heavens themselves blaze forth the death of Princes." (II. ii. 31.)

The second interesting point in the description given in this drama, is to the effect that there was an audible sound produced by the meteors

in their passage through the atmosphere:— "The exhalations whizzing in the air." (II. i. 44.) Compare Olmstead: After stating that most of the meteors were noiseless, we have: "One was accompanied by the noise like the rushing of a sky-rocket"— "A hissing noise is said to have been heard after this explosion"—"like the rush of a distant sky-rocket." (p. 392.) Thirdly, as to the brilliancy of the light produced by the meteors:— "The exhalations whizzing in the air Give so much light that I may read by them. (*Opens the letter and reads*)" (II. i. 44.) Compare Olmstead: —"Their brilliancy was so great that we could at times read common print without much difficulty." (p. 382.) Fourthly, as to the hour of the morning, at which the display was witnessed:—

"*Brutus.* Peace! count the clock.

Cassius. The clock hath stricken three." (II. i. 192.) Compare Olmstead:— "The meteors—were most brilliant from two to five (and) arrived at their maximum, in many places, about four o'clock." (p. 386.) The fifth point of similitude is remarkable:—

"*Decius.* Here lies the east: doth not the day break here?

Casca. No.

Cinna. O, pardon, sir, it doth; and yon gray lines
That fret the clouds are messengers of day.

Casca. You shall confess that you are both deceived.
Here, as I point my sword, the sun arises,
Which is a great way growing on the south
Weighing the youthful season of the year.
Some two months hence up higher towards the north
He first presents his fire; and the high east
Stands, as the Capitol, directly here."

II. i. 101.

(I think the suggestion made by some commentators on this passage that the conversation, given above, expresses some confusion in the minds of the speakers due to Cæsar's change in the calendar two years previously, is an error. Had Decius had in mind the old calendar, he never would have pointed to the east as being the point of sunrise. For in the old, incorrect calendar, the ides of March occurred in the midwinter, at about what is now our Christmas time. And the sun rose then well to the southeast. The reference to "the youthful season of year" suits neither the date of the meteor shower nor the date of Cæsar's death.) At the beginning of the conversation, Decius, pointing to the east thinks it is daybreak. ("Doth not the day break here?") Casca answers in the nega-

tive. Whereupon Cinna states the the light on the clouds indicates the approach of day. Casca again contradicts them stating that they "are both deceived." Then, pointing with his sword towards the southeast, he states that "Here, as I point my sword, the sun rises."

What, then, was the light in the east that attracted Cinna's attention and misled him to such an extent as to make him believe that daybreak was at hand, *in the month of March*, before the clock had "stricken three?" Before I answer this question let me draw attention to one or two points. The date of the action of the play, in these scenes, is the early morning of the day upon which Julius Cæsar was assassinated, viz: the fifteenth of March B. C. 44, ("the ides of March"). Five days later, on March 20th, the sun "crosses the line," and rises in the exact east to an observer upon any part of the habitable globe. But even on March 15th the point on the horizon at which the sun rises, is still, for all practical purposes, due east. To be exact, it is three degrees south of the east point. Casca, in stating that they are both deceived, takes particular care to point to that part of the horizon at which the sun then actually rose, "which is a great way growing on the south;" that is to say, well towards the southeast. This shows, first, that, the author of the play, with his usual carelessness in small matters, overlooked the fact that the date of the action was about that of the spring equinox; secondly, that any meteoric showers occurring between March 20th and September 22d must be excluded from consideration, because during that interval the sun rises always north of the east point and not south of it. (Thus we know that the August meteors are not referred to in the numerous examples I have quoted.) And thirdly, Casca's words prove that the strange light in the east, was not the light of approaching sunrise. What, then, was this peculiar light? The answer to the question has been buried for nearly three quarters of a century in the dusty volumes of the American Journal of Science, and this answer proves that the author of Julius Cæsar was in possession of a fact relating to a meteoric shower, about which, I am safe in saying, even many professional astronomers of to-day are uninformed. Let me quote from Prof. Olmstead's article. "An aurora or boreal light, was seen during the meteoric shower, a little north of east. The lower edge of this bank of light appeared to be several degrees above the horizon"— "Mr. Palmer says that "An auroral light, resembling daybreak, appeared constantly in the east from the time when his observations commenced." (2 o'clock A. M.). Mr. Palmer stated to the writer that this light was so bright, and so much resembled the dawn, that a member of his family got his pail to milk the cows, supposing

it to be daybreak, but found it was only 4 o'clock." (Am. Jour. of Sci., Vol. 26, p. 168.) The references in Hamlet and Julius Cæsar, (it seems to me) refer to one and the same meteoric shower. (Horatio refers to "the mightiest Julius.") I had started out, in this discussion, to establish the date of composition of the 1604 quarto of Hamlet by a comparison of the line in the drama with the data obtained from the pen of the late Prof. Newton regarding a meteoric shower in 1601 or 1602, which data I shall give presently. It is important to note that Prof. Newton's information regarding this particular shower was derived from Chinese annals, and from Chinese annals only. I can find no testimony whatever, regarding it from European sources. And I am driven to the remarkable conclusion that the argument may be reversed, or worked backwards; and that these two plays furnish evidence of a fact hitherto unknown to men of science; that it is likely that such a meteoric shower was seen in Europe about the beginning of the seventeenth century.

It is to Prof. H. A. Newton of Yale College, that we owe the earliest investigation of the Leonid showers. In his paper in "The American Journal of Science and Arts" for 1864. (Second Series, Vol. xxxvii, p. 377, Vol. xxxviii, p. 53) he gives valuable Tables, from which I extract the following:

TABLE OF NOVEMBER METEOR SHOWERS.

No.	YEAR A. D.	DAY & HOUR d. h.	DIFF. in years.
1	902	Oct. 12.17	+ .50
2	931	" 14.10	—3.75
3	934	" 13.17	— .75
4	1002	" 14.10	+ .75
5	1101	" 16.17	0
6	1202	" 18.14	+1.25
7	1366	" 22.17	—1.00
8	1533	" 24.14	— .25
9	1602	" 27.10	+2.25
10	1698	Nov. 8.17	—1.50
11	1799	" 11.21	— .25
12	1832	" 12.16	— .50
13	1833	" 12.22	+ .50

(The jump between showers 9 and 10 is due principally to the change from old to new style in the calendar reckoning.)

The figures in column four represent the difference, in years, between the actual date of each shower, and the average date on which it might have been expected to occur. Thus, the shower No. 9 in the table, which took place October 27, 1602, (O. S.) and which is probably the shower referred to in the dramas, was 2¼ years later than the date calculated from the average of the entire list. The description of it, as given by Newton (l. c. 37, p. 384) is taken from Chinese records.

"A. D., 1602. Period WANG-LI, thirtieth year, ninth month, 18th day of the Cycle (Oct. 27th, O. S.) Several hundred small stars were seen, which parted from each other, and came together again." A second account is as follows:— "During the night, at the fifth hour, a star appeared in the N. E. as large as a hen's egg, and of a bluish white color. It left a bright train. From N. E. of the stars Hia-tai (two stars in the Great Bear,) it went nearly to due west. In the south appeared another star as large as a pestle for pounding grain. Its color was whiteish blue, its train gleamed, and its light illumined the earth. It appeared southwest of TSAN, (the belt and quadrilateral of Orion,) and passed to the group of four stars in Eridanus. After this there were two small stars which followed the large one, and still later there were several hundred shooting stars, great and small, mixed and confused, which followed in the same direction." Prof. Newton points out that the minor displays, Nos. 2, 9, and 10, indicate that unusual numbers of shooting stars, sufficient to attract attention may be seen through a period of five or six years, at least." During a period of 2½ to 3 years on either side of the average date, the display may continue, although with much diminished brilliancy. And he informs us, as the Chinese report indicates, that the shower of October 27th, 1602, was a minor display. This is easily understood, when we remember that the meteors, traveling around the sun in a period of 32¼ years, in an elliptical orbit, as far out as the orbit of the planet Uranus; are not composed of a compact, round ball of meteoric bodies, but are somewhat strung out into a line gradually diminishing in density, which requires at least a year's time to pass the earth's orbit. Therefore, if the earth, in any given year, passes through the main body of the meteors, we have a brilliant shower. Next year the display is much inferior. Thus we find, as a matter of fact, that the meteoric display of November 13th, 1834, was a tame one, compared with the remarkable shower of fire that fell for hours in November, 1833. It is only proper to observe, therefore, that the year 1601 is as likely to have been the year of the brilliant shower in Europe as the year 1602. This statement is based upon the

fact—as column four of the table shows—that the shower No. 9 was later than the average date.

But there was also an Eclipse of the Moon.

—"and the moist star
Upon whose influence Neptune's empire stands
Was sick almost to doomsday with eclipse." (Hamlet I. i. 118.)

Eclipses of the moon, and more especially those of the sun, have been used frequently by historians as a means of determining the date of certain known events in by-gone ages. Thus, an eclipse has been reported as having occurred at the time of a certain battle, or at the death of a certain king. The theory of the moon's motions, in her orbit around the earth, is now so well known that the date of such an event can be established with certainty, if the description given by the old writer is clear and exact. Thus the moon serves as the hour hand of a gigantic clock. But, instead of revolving twice in 24 hours, she makes about twelve and one-third revolutions through the sky in the course of a year. At exactly known dates in every year, the moon passes between the earth and the sun; and in such a case a solar eclipse occurs. In like manner, almost every year, she passes through the earth's shadow; and then we have a lunar eclipse. And Horatio informs us, in the lines referred to, that such an eclipse was one of the "precurse of fierce events" that heaven and earth had demonstrated unto his countrymen. Now it seems that an eclipse of the moon did take place during the early evening of December 9th, 1601, New Style; and that the entire eclipse, lasting over three hours, was visible in London. There are two authorities that can be consulted in such an inquiry: "L'Art de Vérifier les Dates." Paris, 1818, Vol. I of Part II; and von Oppolzer's "Canon der Finsternisse." Vienna, 1887. See also a paper by the Rev. J. Johnson on this particular eclipse, in Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, Vol. 33, p. 405. From these—and other sources,—I gather the following information. Dec. 9th, 1601, (New Style was Sunday, Nov. 29th. Old Style.) The sun set on that day, in London, at 3:49 P. M. The full moon was just clear of the horizon. Half an hour later she began to enter the earth's shadow. As she plunged deeper and deeper into it, the eclipse reached its maximum at a few minutes before six o'clock. All twilight had disappeared, and the spectacle, seen against the dark, eastern sky, must have been a beautiful one. The moon,

then only about two hours high in the heavens, was thus immediately in front of the observer. It is important to note that the entire face of the moon was not eclipsed. Only about eleven digits passed into the shadow. A digit is one-twelfth of the moon's diameter; so that eleven digits correspond to eleven-twelfths of her diameter. A fine, brilliant crescent of light was therefore left on one side of the moon. In other words, the eclipse was not a total one; on the contrary, she "was sick *almost* to doomsday with eclipse." And, thus, Horatio in 1601, and von Oppolzer in 1887, agree exactly in their accounts of the phenomenon. An examination of lunar eclipses from 1598 to 1604, inclusive, gives the following results: Omitting eclipses invisible in Europe, and omitting those in which a small fraction only of the moon was eclipsed (two or three digits,) we have left for consideration five eclipses, as follows:—

(1) Feb. 21, 1598. This eclipse, of 11 8-10 digits, began about four hours after midnight and ended at sunrise. A reference to an eclipse occurring at such an hour of the night, as a "harbinger," would not be understood; for very few people could have seen it. (2) The same may be said of the eclipse of Feb. 10, 1599. This was a total eclipse, the middle of which was at 5:11 A. M. It was, therefore, another early morning eclipse. (3) Aug. 16, 1598. Total eclipse; middle of eclipse 6:47 P. M. The moon rose after 7 o'clock in London, and nearly two-thirds of the eclipse had taken place while the moon was below the horizon. (4) June 4, 1602. Total eclipse. Middle of eclipse 6:18 P. M. Here again the moon did not rise until late (after 8 P. M.) when five-sixths of the eclipse had taken place. Both of these last eclipses were total, and therefore do not correspond to the description given. (5) 1603, May 24. Middle of eclipse about midnight. As only 7 4-10 digits were eclipsed, it, likewise, does not correspond to the description. Only the last two eclipses occurred in the seventeenth century.

No other eclipse occurring during the interval named (1598-1604) requires attention. The Second Quarto was printed in 1604. It is not likely that it was written prior to 1598. And we may take the date of the eclipse described, Dec. 9, 1601, (—Nov. 29, 1601, Old Style,) as a guide in fixing the date of composition of this Second Quarto. It was probably written not long after that event; let us say, in the winter of 1601 or the spring or early summer of 1602. This agrees with the date obtained from the discussion of the "stars with trains of fire." It also agrees with the date upon which the play of Hamlet was licensed, or entered, for publication, on the Stationer's Register, viz: July 26, 1602. Furthermore,

it agrees with the date of the inhibition of June 22, 1600, reissued December 31, 1601, referred to in Hamlet, (II. ii. 343.) This inhibition was an order of the Lords of the Privy Council, directing that only two play houses in London should be open. Hamlet, referring to the tragedians of the city, asks: "How chances it they travel?" Rosencrantz answers: "I think their inhibition comes by the means of the late innovation." In the latter part of 1601 the Globe Company of players was traveling. They traveled also in 1603.

Before concluding this testimony relating to the date of composition of the Second Quarto, a word may be said upon the "Disasters in the Sun." It has been suggested that these words refer to an eclipse of the sun. It may, therefore, be of interest to state that there was an annular eclipse of the sun on Dec. 24th, 1601, New Style, about a fortnight after the lunar eclipse just described. The middle of this solar eclipse occurred one hour after midday. The eclipse "was annular right across England." (Month, Not. Roy. Astr. Socy., 40, 436.)

Summing up the evidence, therefore, we have the following testimony showing the date upon which the Second Quarto was written:

(1) By the meteoric shower: in 1601 or 1602.

(2) By the lunar eclipse: subsequent to Dec. 9, 1601.

(3) By the date of entry on the Stationer's Register: July 26, 1602.

(4) By "the inhibition": subsequent to June 22, 1600, or subsequent to the date of reissue of the order: Dec. 31. 1601.

No one of these four points of evidence, standing alone, would be conclusive. But collectively the testimony they yield is, I think, rather strong. They agree in indicating that the Second Quarto of Hamlet was written in the winter or spring of 1601-1602. I have discovered several other allusions in Hamlet to historical data of the same period, which confirm this date of composition. These allusions, although in a Danish setting, show, also, how very English—how very Elizabethan—was the point of view from which these abstracts and brief chronicles of the time were written.

HENRY PEMBERTON, JR.

THE GENERAL PREFACE TO THE BANKSIDE RESTORATION SERIES.

[By *Permission of* The Shakespeare Press Publishers.]

On the second day of September, in the year 1642, the Long Parliament passed "An ordinance of the Lords and Commons concerning Stage-Plays." This ordinance provided as follows:

"Whereas, the distracted state of Ireland, steeped in her own blood, and the distracted state of England threatened with a cloud of blood by Civil War, call for all possible means to appease and avert the wrath of God, appearing in these Judgments, amongst which Fasting and Prayer, having been often tried to be very effective, have been lately and still enjoined: and Whereas, Public Sports do not well agree with Public Calamities, nor Public Stage Plays with seasons of Humiliation, this being an exercise of sad and pius solemnity, and the other being spectacles of Stage-Plays."

"Pleasure so commonly expressing Lascivious Mirth and Levity; it is therefore, thought fit and ordained by the Lords and Commons in this Parliament assembled, that while these sad causes and set times of Humiliation do continue, Public Stage Plays shall cease and be foreborne. Instead of which, are recommended to the people of this land, the Profitable and Seasonable considerations of Repentance, Reconciliation and Peace with God, which probably will produce outward Peace and prosperity, and bring again times of Joy and Gladness to the Nation."

This was the first Ordinance of the Long Parliament against Stage-Plays and Interludes. Not being as effective as desired, on October twenty-second, 1647, a still more severe Ordinance was passed, entitled "For the Better Suppression of Stage-Plays, Interludes and Common Players." But even this proved ineffectual. Though the public Theatres were closed in consequence, and Plays were contraband, yet stages were improvised at taverns, in booths and at Fairs, and mountebanks and strolling players of every description still supplied the masses with such theatricals as their tastes craved. Parliament therefore, February ninth, 1648, passed the most drastic measure of all, which declared "that all Stage-Players, and Players in Interludes and Common Players, are hereby declared to be, and are, and shall be taken to be, Rogues, and punished within the statutes of the thirty-ninth Elizabeth and the Seventh of the Reign of James the First." The first cited of these Acts, the 39th Elizabeth, was the one entitled, "An act for the Punishment of Rogues, Vagabonds and Common Beggars," and pro-

vided the severest punishment for all such as could be brought within these entitled classes—saving and excepting only such Players as might be under patronage of a Baron of the Realm or other honorable person of greater degree—who might continue to present and perform in Stage Plays and Interludes. But now the Parliament exempted nobody—and every Actor, Stage Player, and Player of Interludes—under whatsoever protection, was forbidden to present anything in the nature of a Play or an Interlude—subject to the penalties attaching to "Rogues, Vagabonds and Common Beggars," under the statutes of Elizabeth and of James.

This closed all theatres, public and private, regular or improvised. Although sullenly conscious that the temptation of Puritan rulers was—(not entirely without a certain satisfaction in the boredom of others not rulers—that, as Macauley expressed it, the sin of bear-bating lay, not in that it gave pain to the bear, but that it gave pleasure to the spectator,) the masses acquiesced—and, for a space, not only the Theatre, but all those sports and pastimes which had made England "Merry England," were discontinued. Not to make long prayers, not to sing nasal psalms, or not to name ones children "Obejoyful" (!!!) or "If-Christ-Had-not-Died-for-thee-thou-Hadst-been-Damned"—or at the least Milchizedek or other large Old Testament name, was to be in league with the Devil or other Enemy of the Long Parliament, and therefore a traitor to one's country.

It was a remark of M. Taine that the English are a sombre people—and that the miasma of the Fens which called forth the sombreness of Beouwuf, still influences Englishmen, and compels them to go the whole way—when they go at all! But it was also a foregone conclusion that when the Re-action to this Hydraulic suppression of the elastic impulses of a whole people came—it would be a cosmic one!

The Re-action came when Charles the Second was crowned at Whitehall amid frantic acclamations of delight. And naturally the Drama—the Theatre—was the first to feel the inspiration of the new Regime! This Mons Pelée explosion does not, however, concern us here, except in so far as it brought Shakespeare back to his pedestal—to be "Reformed" and "Restored" however, to suit the uttermost Lisence and impropriety which could express the other extreme of the popular pendulum.

And there had also been another cause at work. Even before the Long Parliament, during the reigns of Charles the First, there had been a sensible decline of the Drama, and no single Dramatist of the first class. Fletcher, the last of the Shakespearean Dramatists, was senile. Shirley was not important, and practically a generation had passed without any notable work

being added to Dramatic Literature. When, therefore, the new Dispensation came in, and the theatres—closed—as Pepys deftly put it—(wiping out the ten years Commonwealth forever in as many words)—"since his majesty hath been so long abroad" re-opened—the first recourse for plays was to the past. And to what past was there recourse—but to the giant of the Elizabethan Drama—Shakespeare!

That Shakespeare, to be acceptable to this new age, must be rewritten "with Carpentry and French," is so familiar that we need not again describe it. Nor were those antique Bores, the three Unities, too far away to further complicate matters. No doubt the gentleman who now straightway proceeded to "Make Plays" out of Shakespeare, believed that any amount of lubricity would be justified if only that Trinity of unkind Virgins presided over the proprieties (or, rather the Improprieties) they contemplated. The quarrel between the adherents of the two schools had not slept before the closing of the Theatres in 1642, and was readily taken up again, upon their reopening, at the time of The Restoration. The adherents of Jonson were reinforced by the King, who favored everything that was French, and who brought with him out of France the French ideas and tastes, as well as the French vices of the times. Upon the reopening of the Theatres, Dramatists were put to their wit's end to supply the demand for new plays, and readily turned to the plays that had once been so popular and sought to adapt them to the stage of the period, and make them more popular by making them conform, not only to the Unities, now regarded as so essential, but to the latitudenarianism so everywhere in the air! Many other curiosities will appear in the analyses of this "Restoration" period. In the prevalence of such a transanimate task it could be written of almost any local poet—as Cartwright wrote of Fletcher, that

> "Shakespeare to thee was dull, whose best jest lies,
> In ladies questions, and the fool's replies;
> Old fashioned art, which walks from town to town
> In turned hose which our fathers called the clown;
> Whose wit our nice times would obsceneness call,
> And which made baudry pass for comical;
> Nature was all his art, thy verse was free
> As his, but without his scurrility;"

to apply the sentiment of the last four of these lines to Shakespeare seems quite as palpable an obscession as to suppose that the statement in the seventh line, that "nature was all his Art," was not the highest possible praise!

And yet it must not be forgotten that during all of this period in which the drama was being corrupted, and Shakespeare was being adapted to the "enlightened age," his real works were stlll calmly coming from the press undefiled, and based upon the text of 1623. The Third Folio appeared in 1664 and the Fourth Folio in 1685, and many quarto editions of single plays were issued during the period from 1660 down to 1700 in their original undefiled form. Even while this base appetite of the age was still dominant, Nicholas Rowe brought out his First Edition of Shakespeare's Works in 1709; perhaps the most important event—in view of time and place—in all Shakespeare history, except, of course, the appearances of the Quartos and Folios themselves! It was, and remains, the first "Edited," as well as the first illustrated, Edition of Shakespeare—and the first to be preceded by an attempt at a Biography of him—so that, in the midst of all this Lisence it is apparent that there was still in England a modicum of scholarship which had not bowed the knee to Baal!

Nor, in conclusion, should a word be wanting as to the state of the applied science of Stagecraft in this second Caroline period. In the Introduction to the Seventh Volume of THE BANKSIDE SHAKESPEARE is a demonstration that Shakespeare was not only the earliest great English Dramatist, but the earliest great English Dramaturgist as well—that he not only perfected Dramatic Art, but commanded and commandeered the Stagecraft Art to serve him—that he was not only the greatest of Dramatists, but the greatest of Stage-rights! THE BANKSIDE SHAKESPEARE is in the hands of its grand possessors—and this BANNKSIDE RESTORATION Series, will, we are of surety, find an identical possession! Together, these epochical works will appeal—as indeed this BANKSIDE RESTORATION Series (which now, for the first time, presents students of the Drama with the Restored play—as against the text of a play as Shakespeare left it—thus indicating at a glance wherein Shakespeare was "dull" in the view of the "refined age" of Charles the Second, and how a refining process could be accomplished), will appeal, not only to the studious, but to the curious, student of Shakespeare.

WILLIS VICKERY.

NOT BACON, BUT MARLOWE OR RUTLAND.

In the year 1893, Mr. Wilson Gleason Zeigler, a lawyer of New York City, presented an alternate to the Bacon Authorship theory as follows:

Instead of Christopher Marlowe being killed in a fight with one Archer, he killed Archer (or Fraser, or Ingram, as otherwise named.) That after Marlowe had killed him, the proprietors of the Theatres for which he wrote Plays, spirited him away and maintained him in concealment in order that he might still write plays for them. An authorship for such Plays being necessary, William Shakespeare their clever and brilliant co-manager seemed the safest person to whom to assign the authorship. Mr. Zeigler proceeded to support his theory as follows:

I. The extraordinary similarity between the alleged Shakespeare work and Marlowe's characteristics: Above all, the inevitable tendency to carry extremes of grief into rhodomontade, as for example:

Second Part of Tamburlaine: II. iv.	*Hamlet III. iii.*
Raise cavalieras higher than the clouds	Now pile your dust upon the quick and dead,
And with the cannon break the frame of heaven	Til of this feat a mountain you have made
Batter the shining palace of the sun	To o'ertop Pelion, or, the skyish head
And shiver all the starry firmament!	Of blue Olympus!

Against the record of Marlowe's death, in June, 1593, aged twenty-five, stabbed with his own sword in a tavern broil, we find the issue clouded with the usual uncertainties. In September, 1593, Harvey writes that Marlowe died from the Plague ("Weep, Bowles, thy Tambourlaine voutsafes to dye. * * * He and the plague contended for the game.") In 1597, Thomas Beard, a Puritan (Theatre of God's Judgments; first Edition.) "It so fell out that in London streets this barking dogge proposed to stab one whom he owed a grudge unto with his dagger—he stabbed his owne dagger into his owne head." "As the Poet Lycophron was shot to death by a certain rival of his, so Christopher Marlowe was stabbed to death by a bawdy seruing-man, a rival of his in his lewde love." (Palladis Tamia, 1598.) But in Vaughan's "Golden Grove" (1600) the account runs thus: "Not inferior to these was one Christopher Marlowe, by profession a play-

maker, who, as is reported, about fourteen years ago wrote a book against the Trinitie. It so happened that at Deptford, a little village about three miles from London, as he meant to stab his ponyard into one named Ingram —he killed himself." But Samuel Rowland (1600) ascribed his death to over-drinking: "As for three Worthies on his hoste's wall | He knows three worthy drunkards pass them alle | The first of them, in many a Tavern tried. | At last subdued by aqua vitae died! | Aubrey: Lives of Eminent Men (1680, citing page 415." Sr. Ed. Sherburne) says: "He [Ben Jonson] killed Mr. Marlow, ye poet, 1598, on Bunhill coming from the Green Curtaine Play House." And finally the burial Register of St. Nicholas' Church, Deptford, has the entry "Christopher Marlow, slaine by Francis Frazer, in 1 of Anne 1593." The Encyclopædia Britannica—following Dyce and all the other authorities, says that the man that killed Marlowe was named Francis Archer. But no amount of investigation tells us what became of the slayer. No record of his trial, or of his escape from justice. And this obscurity as to the death of Marlowe cannot be charged to the obscurity of Marlowe himself. He was a prominent character. He was written of by Greene, Peeler, Harvey, Lodge, Chapman, Petlowe, Blunt, and Chettle. We have a record of Ben Jonson being imprisoned and "brought near the gallows." The result of the above confusion is, that, whereas the entry in St. Nicholas' Church makes Marlowe to have died in 1593, Aubrey places his death five years later in 1598. If Aubrey was right, Marlowe might have had time, in five years to have produced the Shakespeare plays which did not begin to appear under that name until 1598. This is Mr. Ziegler's "Marlowe Theory." It certainly is remarkable that the death of so prominent a character as Marlowe could be so variously stated. Even if his career as a playwright had been overlooked, he had become notorious by being presented to the Queen for blasphemy. (This accusation is preserved: "Harleian MSS. 6858, Fol. 320." A note containing the opinion of one Christopher Marlye, concerning his damnable opinions and judgment of Religion and scorne of God's Worde: "Endorsed:" Copy of Marlowe's blasphemyes as sente to her Highnesse. Below is a memorandum to the effect that within three days after its delivery "Marlye came to a soden and fearfull ende of his life"—) Mr. Ziegler has therefore found the hiatus necessary to locate his theory in! And now comes the Rutland Theory! One "Dr. Karl Bleibtreu"' whose name we now hear for the first time—prints, in Berlin, a book to declare that the real Shakespeare was not William of Stratford-on-Avon, but Roger, Earl of Rutland, who was born on Oct. 6, 1576, and who was the son-in-law of Sir Philip Sidney.

This learned and hitherto unheralded German admits that the train of thought which led him to regard Roger, Earl of Rutland, as the genuine Shakespeare was suggested to him by a little book by a German named Avor, entitled "The New Shakespeare Gospel," which was recently published at Munich. Dr. Bleibtreu adduces detailed circumstantial evidence in support of his theory that the Earl of Rutland wrote the Shakespearean dramas. He declares that the low comedian William Shakespeare, "who regularly got drunk at the Mermaid Tavern," (sic.) could not possibly have had the wide learning and knowledge of other countries, particularly of Italy, France, and Denmark, which the author of the Shakespearen works possessed.

But Roger, Earl of Rutland, started on the grand tour of Europe in 1596. He visited France and Italy; stayed at Verona, Venice, Mantua, Rome, and Milan; studied law in the University of Padua; and, after his return to London, settled down as a resident in Gray's Inn. The Earl of Rutland accompanied the Earl of Essex in his expedition to the Azores, "thereby gaining the experience which enabled him to write The Tempest." He also fought in Holland, explaining various references to Dutch life in the Shakespearean works. He was sentenced to life-long imprisonment in 1601, a period unmarked, so, Dr. Bleibtreu asserts, by the production of a single Shakespearean drama. In 1603, the Earl went to Denmark to attend the baptism of the Danish Crown Prince as the representative of James I, thereby gaining a knowledge of Denmark from which the local color for Hamlet might have been furnished. This explains, according to Dr. Bleibtreu, the description of the terrace at Elsinore in the latter play. Here he met the courtiers Guilderstein and Rosencranz at the Danish court, and it is held to be significant that two young Barons Rosencranz were fellow students of the Earl at Padua. The dramas that critics consider the last of the Shakespearean series, "Coriolanus" and "The Tempest," appeared in 1612, and the Earl of Rutland died on June 26 of that year. Dr. Bleibtreu points to the significance in this coincidence of dates, and declares that this, taken in conjunction with all the other evidence, is a convincing proof that that nobleman was the true Shakspeare.

He treats in detail the reasons which led the Earl of Rutland to adopt a pseudonym and conceal himself behind the name of another, and is convinced that family archives in the possession of the Duke of Rutland contain valuable evidence in support of his contention that Roger, Earl of Rutland, wrote the Shakspearean dramas. He intends to visit England next year in order to pursue further investigations in that direction. Meanwhile, he

hopes that English Shakespearean scholars will follow up the line of research which he has indicated in his work.

We are not able to find further mention of the pleasantry of this Dr. Simonson's perpetration from the added comment from Berlin that he perpetrates his book "The True Shakespeare," by writing a play in five acts entitled "Shakespeare," in which he intends to demonstrate from the reasons that induced the Earl of Rutland to conceal himself behind the name of another. Queen Elizabeth, the Earls of Leicester, Essex, Southampton, and Pembroke, Sir Walter Raleigh, Lord Burghley, Ben Jonson, Bacon, Earl of Rutland, and "the actor William Shakespeare" are the principal persons in the play. The first and second acts are laid in 1585, and the third and fourth acts, which the hiss are taken place in 1612. The scenes in the first four acts are set in London, while the action of the fifth takes place at Stratford-on-Avon. The play will be produced in Berlin in March next year. Doubtless the play, good play, even if written by a learned professor, will be better than the Theory, good Theory, of the Rutland Authorship of Shakespeare!

The only genuine value of the Marlowe or Rutland Theory, or of both together, is doubtless as indicative of the limitations of criticism previous which the personality of our Shakespearean genius has at last produced

Department of Textual Criticism

Conducted by EDWARD MERTON DEY, ESQ.

[Contributions to this Department need not be typewritten. Correspondence should be addressed to Mr. Dey, P. O. Box 1333, St. Louis, Missouri, U. S. A.]

"Romeo and Juliet," I. ii. 101-2.—

> But in that chrystal scales let there be weigh'd
> Your lady's love against some other maid.

I do not think this means, as Clarke suggests: "Let there be weighed the little love your lady bears you against the charms of some other maid." We are not told that she bears him any love at all. But considering her love as a thing in supposition, and estimating the desirableness of it, could it be won, we may understand, "let there be weighed the value of your lady's love against the value of the love of some other maid."

The reading "lady-love" was suggested by Theobald in his edition of 1733, but according to N. E. D. he was the first to use this word, no instance of its use occurring in Shakespeare. Dyce's reference to R. Wilson's "Cobler's Prophesie" (1594) is considered as not affording an example since "Venus is called 'Lady Love' by more than one of the dramatis personæ."

To me "lady-love" seems to signify a reciprocal relation, and this opinion is in a measure confirmed by the foregoing quotation from N. E. D., which intimates that a lady-love could belong to only one—that is, only to him whose love she returned. In the sense of mutual affection Rosaline was not Romeo's lady-love; therefore, Theobald's suggestion is doubly unhappy.

E. M. D.

For ready reference in connection with recent editions the following notes are transferred to the pages of our Review from London "Notes and Queries" of April 7, 1906.

"The Winter's Tale," V. i. 12:—

Leon. Bred his hopes out of, true.
Paul. Too true (my Lord:)

Theobald gave the closing word of the king's speech, "true," to Paulina, in which he is followed by nearly all the modern editors. I think the change is uncalled for. The old dictatorial spirit of Leontes is gone, the Folio reading of this line giving us an insight into his changed character. Cleomenes, whose speech opens the scene, makes an assertion, beginning with—

Sir, you have done enough, and have perform'd
A Saint-like sorrow:

which Leontes does not feel to be merited. In contrite refutation, the king speaks of the excellent qualities of his lost queen, and at the close turns to Paulina for sympathetic confirmation. Paulina's "Too true, my lord," is the proper reply (by intensified repetition) to the king's question—"True?" The only correction necessary in the Folio reading is to show "true," the closing word of the king's speech, as an interrogation.

E. M. D.

"Love's Labour's Lost," II. i. 45.—The Folio reads:—

Well fitted in Arts, glorious in Armes.

The attempts to cure the defective rhythm of this line overlook the many proofs that the text was set up by hearing and not by seeing. I believe it tis plain that "as" has been lost after "Arts":—

A man of souveraigne parts he is esteem'd;
Well fitted in Arts, as glorious in Armes;

meaning, of course, "as (he is) glorious in Armes."

E. M. D.

"As You Like It," II. i. 50:—

Left and abandon'd of his velvet friend.

The generally accepted emendation "friends," for the singular form of the Folio, seems an unfortunate alteration of the old text. While the indifference of a passing herd to the sufferings of one of their kind is touched upon later, the present passage is distinct from the later one, and has an entirely different bearing. A severed relation of a closer nature is indicated in this line. Recollecting the well-known habit of deer to go in couples, it is strange that

Left and abandon'd of his velvet friend

has never been taken as referring to the desertion, through fright, of her unfortunate companion by the doe. "Velvet," as descriptive of the soft coat of the female, and "friend," as indicating the attachment of the mate, are highly significant.

E. M. D.

MARGINALIA

MR. ALFRED AUSTIN—POET LAUREATE OF ENGLAND, AND SO SUCCESSOR to Ben Jonson, Mr. James Pye, et. al., lately wrote to "The Times," (London), that "Shakespeare could by no possibility have borrowed prose passages from any one and made poetry of them by turning them into verse." Mr. Austin insists that poetry is not made in that fashion. Says he: "The white heat, the fine frenzy of the brain, in the moment of such composition, precludes so cold a procedure."

Mr. Austin perhaps overlooked in his own "white heat" and "fine frenzy of the brain," the following:

HENRY THE FIFTH. I. II. 35.

Canterbury. There is no bar
To make against your highness' claim to France
But this, which they produce from Pharamond,—
'In terram Salicam mulieres ne succedant;'
'No woman shall succeed in Salique land;'
Which Salique land the French unjustly gloze
To be the realm of France, and Pharamond
The founder of the law and female bar.
Yet their own authors faithfully affirm
That the land Salique is in Germany,
Between the floods of Sala and of Elbe;

HOLINSHED'S CHRONICLES.

"The verie words of that supposed law are these. In terram Salicam mulieres ne succedant, that is to saie, into the Salike land let not women succeed. Which the French glossers expound to be the realme of France, and that this law was made by King Pharamond; whereas yet their owne authors affirme that the land Salike is in Germanie betweene the rivers of Elbe and Sala; and that when Charles the Great had overcome the Saxons, he placed there certaine Frenchmen, which having in disdeine the dishonest manners of the Germane women, made a law, that the females should not succeed

Where Charles the great, having subdued the Saxons,
There left behind and settled certain French;
Who, holding in disdain the German women,
For some dishonest manners of their life.
Establish'd then this law,—to wit, no female
Should be inheretrix in Salique land;
Which Salique, as I said, 'twixt Elbe and Sala.
Is at this day in Germany call'd Meisen.
Then doth it well appear, the Salique law
Was not devised for the realm of France;
Nor did the French possess the Salique land
Until four hundred one and twenty years
After defunction of king Pharamond,
Idly suppos'd the founder of this law;
Who died within the year of our redemption
Four hundred twenty-six; and Charles the great
Subdued the Saxons, and did seat the French
Beyond the river Sala, in the year
Eight hundred five. Besides, their writers say,
King Pepin, which deposed Childerick,
Did, as heir general, being descended
Of Blithild, which was daughter to king Clothair,

to any inheritance within that land, which at this day is called Meisen, so that if this be true, this law was not made for the realme of France, nor the Frenchmen possessed the land Salike, till four hundred and one and twentie years after the death of Pharamond, the supposed maker of this Salike law, for this Pharamond deceased in the yeare 426, and Charles the Great subdued the Saxons, and placed the Frenchmen in those parts beyond the river of Sala, in the yeare 805.

"Moreover it appeareth by their owne writers that King Pepine, which deposed Childerike, claimed the crowne of France, as heire generall, for that he was descended of

Make claim and title to the crown of France.
Hugh Capet also,—who usurp'd the crown
Of Charles the duke of Loraine, sole heir male
Of the true line and stock of Charles the great,—
To find his title, with some shows of truth,
(Though, in pure truth, it was corrupt and naught,)
Convey'd himself as th' heir to th' lady Lingare,
Daughter to Charlemain, who was the son
To Lewis the emperor, and Lewis the son
Of Charles the great; Also king Lewis the tenth,
Who was sole heir to the usurper Capet,
Could not keep quiet in his conscience,
Wearing the crown of France, till satisfied
That fair queen Isabel, his grandmother,
Was lineal of the lady Ermengare.
Daughter of Charles the aforesaid duke of Loraine:
By the which marriage, the line of Charles the great
Was re-united to the crown of France.
So that, as clear as is the summer's sun,
King Pepin's title, and Hugh Capet's claim,

Blithild, daughter to King Clothaire the first: Hugh Capet also, who usurped the crowne upon Charles Duke of Loraine, the sole male heire male of the line and stocke of Charles the Great, to make his title seeme true, and appeare good, though in deed it was starke naught, conveied himself as heire to the ladie Lingard, daughter to King Charlemaine sonne to Lewes the emperour, that was son to Charles the Great. King Lewes the tenth, otherwise called saint Lewes, being verie heire to the said usurper Hugh Capet, could never be satisfied in his conscience how he might justlie keepe and possesse the crowne of France, till he was persuaded and fullie instructed that queene Isabell his grandmother was lineallie descended of the ladie Ermengard daughter and heire to the above Charles duke of Loraine, by the which marriage, the blood and line of Charles the great was again restored to the crowne and scepter of France, so that more cleeare than the sunne it openlie appeareth that the title of king Pepin, the claime of Hugh Capet, the possession of Lewes, yea, and the French kings to this daie, are derived and conveied from the heire female, though they would under the cover of such a fained law, barre the kings and princes of this realme of England of their right and lawfull inheritance."

King Lewis his satisfaction, all appear
To hold in right and title of the female;
So do the kings of France unto this day;
Howbeit they would hold up this Salique law,
To bar your highness claiming from the female;
And rather choose to hide them in a net,
Than amply to imbar their crooked titles
Usurp'd from you and your progenitors.

To suppose that a great crown-lawyer like Lord Bacon would have cited precedents from a popular history, instead from his law books, is quite as preposterous as that when, in the "Taming of the Shrew" (I. i. 167) he had occasion to quote from Terence, he did not turn to the copy of Terence in his library, but copied from a boy's school-book. Lily's Latin Grammar!

We receive no periodical so packed with important material for the student of Languages and Letters, as "The Modern Language Review—a quarterly journal devoted to the study of mediæval and modern Literature and Philology." This quarterly is edited by Dr. John G. Robertson, assisted by an advisory board comprising such eminent scholars as Professor Dowden, Dr. Kunmeyer, Professor Skeat, Mr. W. W. Greg, W. R. Morfel and seven others, and is issued by the University of Cambridge (England) Press. It contains contributions always in French and German—not in translation, and every one of them of the highest preservative value. In the July issue, the Editor, Dr. Robertson, writes of "The Knowledge of Shakespeare on the Continent at the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century." He notes that the earliest occurrence of the name of Shakespeare on the continent is in Untericht von der Teutschen Sprache und Poesie—of Daniel Georg Morhof, "Polyhistor," (Kiel, 1682.) The next is in Les Jugements de Savants, by Adrien Baillet, (Paris, 1685.) The next was in a French translation of Sir William Temple's Essay on Poetry, (Utrecht, 1693.) Then follow mention of the great Dramatist in a Latin

tract: Vindiciae nominis Germanici contra quosdam obrectatores Gallos (Amsterdam, 1694.) A Review of Dryden's Essay of Dramatic Poetry—in the Acta Eruditorum, (Leipsig, January, 1702.) An announcement of Rowe's Edition—in Le Journal des Savans (October, 1708.) Allgemeines historiches Lexicon. J. F. Buddeus, (Leipsig, 1709.) Compendiöses Geleherten. J. B. Mencke, Lexicon, (Leipsig, 1715.) After this references in German and French become numerous, though Dr. Robertson notes, not as numerous as are references to Milton or Dryden. The earliest Italian reference was in a letter prefatory to Il Cesare, a tragedy written by the Abbe-Antonio Conti (Faenia, 1726.) The Abbe had been shown Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar by the Duke of Buckingham—when visiting London. This letter says Dr. Robertson contains the first continental criticism "which not merely regards Shakespeare with respect, but hints at the possibility of a continental nation learning from him." In 1732 the Swiss Critic Bodmer in a preface to his German translation of Paradise Lost, mentions "Shakespeare der Engellandische Sophocles." But in 1740 in later works, he calls him "Sasper" and "Saspar."

In 1741. A Drama. Der Tod des Julius Cæsar, which was the first translation ever made of a Shakespeare play, appeared. It was written in alexandrines, and was printed at Berlin. Its author was Kaspar Wilhelm von Borck, the Prussian Ambassador in London, from 1735 to 1738. Dr. Robertson thinks that this may have been meant as a direct challenge to Voltaire, whose Mort de Cesar, translated by J. F. Scharffenstein, had appeared in Germany in 1737, and he concludes: "It is worth chronicling that between 1726 and 1741 three versions of Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar, in three of the chief languages of Europe, carried not merely the English poet's name; but something, and in the German case a very great deal, of his art to the nations of the continent."

The Malone Society, instituted to collect, study and reprint examples of the Early English Drama, was founded at the University of London College, July 30th, 1906. An annual subscription of one guinea entitles to membership upon application with sufficient credentials. Applications for membership are to be received by W. W. Greg, Esq., Park Lodge, Wimbledon, London, S. W. England.

The Clifton Shakespeare Society of Bristol, England, sends us the Study and Debate Programme for its thirty-second consecutive session, 1906-1907. It is gratifying as well as complimentary to note that on several denoted occasions it will take as texts for discussion, theses from "Shakespeareana," (our predecessor Quarterly—then under the same edi-

torship as NEW SHAKESPEAREANA) to wit: December 8th, 1906, Dr. Appleton Morgan on "Pericles—its claim to a Shakespearean Authorship." (Shakespeareana, VIII, February 9, 1907. Mr. Alfred Waite's "Did Ben Jonson write Bacon's Works?" (Id. VI.) Mr. Elias C. Calkins's "Ben Jonson not Bacon's Amanuensis." (Id. VIII.) In the wreck, and (sometimes) the pathetic crash, of British Shakespeare Societies, the placid and consecutive life of The Clifton Shakespeare Society, attracts conspicuous attention.

Books Received

224. A Shakespeare Phonology. With a Rime-Index to the Poems as a Pronouncing Vocabulary. By Wilhelm Vietor, M. A., Ph.D., Professor of English Philology in the University of Marburg, etc. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 290. New York: Lemcke and Buechner.

225. Some Questions of Legal Ethics suggested by the Life and Career of Lord Chancellor Bacon, Viscount St. Albans. By Richard L. Ashhurst. Paper, 8vo., pp. 29. Bedford Springs Publishing Co.

226. William Shakespeare. Leben und Werke von Eduard Engel (Drittee umbgearbeitete Auflage.) Cloth, sq., 12mo., pp. 73. Leipsig: Verlag von J. Baedeker.

227. The Tragedie of Chabot, Admirall of France. By George Chapman and James Shirley. Reprinted from the Quarto of 1639. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes by Ezra Lehman. Sometime Harrison Fellow in English of the University of Pennsylvania. Paper. Royal 8vo., pp. 124. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania.

229. The Bride. By Samuel Rowlands. Reprinted for the first time from a copy of the Original edition of 1617 in the Library of Harvard College. With an introductory note by Alfred Claghorn Potter. Roxburge, 5½ by 6½. Boston: Printed for C. E. Godspeed at the Merrymount Press.

231. John Webster. The Period of his work as determined by his Relations to the Drama of his play. By Elmer Edgar Stoll, A. M., Ph.D. 8vo., paper, pp. 215. Cambridge, Mass.: The Harvard Co-operative Society.

232. Shakespeare, Marston and The Malcontent Type. By Elmer Edgar Stoll, A. M., Ph.D., 8vo., paper, pp. 20. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

235. Did Shakespeare Write Titus Andrononicus? A Study in Elizabethan Literature. By John M. Robertson. Cloth, 8vo., pp. 255. London: Watts and Company.

236. The First Folio Shakespeare. Twelfe Night, or What You Will. Edited, with Notes, Introduction, Glossary. Variorum Readings, and selected

criticism. By Charlotte Porter and Helen A. Clarke. 4½ by 6½. Cloth, pp. 210. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co.

240. Alterations and Adaptations of Shakespeare. By Frederick W. Kilbourne, Ph.D. Cloth, 12mo., pp. 299. Boston: Richard G. Badger, The Gorham Press (price $1.50.)

241. A Whimsey Authology. Collected by Carolyn Wells. Cloth, 7 x 3½, pp. 279. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

242. The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist. By George P. Baker. New York: The Macmillan Company.

243. The Treasury of Sacred Song. Selected from the English Lyrical Poetry of Four Centuries. With notes, explanatory and Bibliographical. By Francis T. Palgrave, Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. 12mo, cloth, pp. 374. Oxford, at The Clarendon Press. Henry Frowde, London and New York.

244. Where Shakespeare Set His Stage. By Elsie Lathrop, with twenty-two photo-gravure illustrations, and decorated in colors by G. W. Hood, de Grand luxe in box. 8vo., pp. 247. New York: James Pott and Company.

245. Aus Shakespeares Meisterwerkstatt. Stilgeschichtleche Studien von Gregor Sarrazin. Paper, 8vo., pp. 226. Berlin-Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer.

246. The Farce of Master Pierre Patelin. Composed by an unknown author about 1469 A. D., Englished by Richard Holbrook. Illustrated with fac-simile of the woodcuts in the Edition of Pierre Levet, *ca.* 1489. Roxburge, pp. 115. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. The Riverside.

247. The Text of Shakespeare. Its History from the Publication of the Quarto and Folios down and including the Publication of the Editions of Pope and Theobald. By Thomas R. Lounsbury, L. H. D., LL.D., Professor of English in Yale University. Cloth, 8vo, pp. 579. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

248. The Name of William Shakespeare. A study in Orthography. By John Louis Haney, Ph.D., Professor of English Philology in the Central High School of Philadelphia. Cloth, 12mo, pp. 68. Philadelphia: The Egerston Press. $1.00.

249. Babel and Bible. Three Lectures on the Significance of Assyriological Research for Religion. Embodying the most Important Criticisms, and the Author's Replies. By Dr. Frederick Delitzoch. 8vo., boards,

pp. 247. Portrait and many illustrations. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company.

250. The Complete Dramatic and Poetic Works of William Shakespeare. Edited from the text of the Early Quartos and the First Folio. By William Allan Neilson. IV, cloth crown, 8vo., pp. 1250. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. The Riverside Press. Price $3.00.

251. Kate. A Comedy in Four Acts. By Bronson Howard. Cloth, pp. 211. New York and London: Harper & Brothers.

252. Early English Dramatists. 1550-1553. The Dramatic Writings of Richard Wever and Thomas Inglelend. Comprising Lusty Juventus, Disobedient Child, Nice Wanton, Note Book and Word in each volume. List S. Edited by John S. Farmer. 1497-1580. The Dramatic Writings of John Heywood. Comprising The Pardoner and the Frier, The Four P. P., John the Husband, Tyb his Wife and Sir John the Priest, Play of the Weather, Play of Love, Dialogue concerning Witty and Witless. 1497-1580. The Proverbs, Epigrams and Miscellanies of John Heywood, Dialogue of Proverbs Concerning Marriage, The First Hundred of Epigrams, Three Hundred Epigrams Upon Three Hundred Proverbs, The Fifth Hundred of Epigrams, Miscellaneous. 1550-1565. Anonymous Plays, (Three Volumes, Third Series), Jack Juggler, King Darius, Gammer Gurtons Needle, New Custom, Trial of Treasure. First Series. Four Elements, Calesto and Melebala, Everyman, Hickscorner, The World and The Child, Thersites. 1563. The Dramatic Writings of Ulpian Fulwell. Comprising Like Well to Like, etc. Six volumes, sq., 16mo., boards. London: Printed for The Early English Dramatic Society.

253. Old Castle-Falstaff in der englishen Literatur and bis zu Shakespeare. von Wilhelm Baeske (Palaestra I.) 8vo., paper, pp. vii, 119. Berlin: Mayer & Müller.

256. Francis Bacon's Cryptic Rhymes, and the Truth they Reveal. By Edward Bormann. Royal 8vo, cloth, pp. 251. London: Siegle, Hill & Co.

257. Shakespeare and the Modern Stage, with other Essays. By Sidney Lee. 8vo., cloth, pp. 241. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

258. Tolstoy on Shakespeare. A Critical Essay on Shakespeare. By Leo Tolstoy. Translated by V. Tchertkoff and I. F. M. Followed by Shakespeare's Attitude to the Working Classes. By Ernest Crosby and a Letter from G. Bernard Shaw. 16mo., pp. 170, cloth. New York and London: The Funk and Wagnalls Company.

259. Sir Henry Irving. A Biography. By Percy Fitzgerald. Author

of the Life of David Garrick. Cloth, 8vo. Portraits and illustrations, pp. xvi-320. Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs & Co.

225. This is the address of a distinguished Lawyer, delivered before a meeting of distinguished Lawyers. Mr. Ashhurst's text is: the lofty and definitive sense of honor which dictates the Lawyer's duties to his Client, to the Court and to the State. Such noble words nobly said, are worthy the occasion of the eminet speaker. It is because Mr. Ashhurst, however, in illustrating the duty of the Lawyer to the Court, (that is, to the State,) uses the life and career of Lord Chancellor Bacon as examples, that we are reviewing his masterly address in this connection. It will be remembered that Mr. W. G. Peckham, also a distinguished lawyer, (NEW SHAKESPEAREANA, ante. Vol. V, page 47) in reviewing Dr. Wallace's discovery of the Chancery Pleadings in the British Public Record Office, took occasion to say much the same things about Lord Bacon that Mr. Ashhurst says. A layman should not perhaps call the attention of two distinguished lawyers to the fact that Lord Chancellor Bacon, (who is dead, by the way, and cannot defend himself) was a Lawyer also. Do lawyers alone, of all men, refuse to recognize the rule nil nisi?

Mr. Peckham said. "About the time of these pleadings (1614-1615) Francis Bacon had completed his base pretence of friendship for the Earl of Essex, and was helping to bring the Earl to the gallows." As Essex had suffered death thirteen years before these pleadings began (1601), is Mr. Peckham justified in continuing: "In these days Francis Bacon was supervising the inhuman torture of old Peacham." Hepworth Dixon, who inspected all the original papers in the case, in his "Personal History of Lord Bacon," says (page 225): "Bacon was not at all responsible for Peacham's prosecution. The prosecution was ordered by the Privy Council, of which he was not a member." Mr. Peckham also says: "About this time Bacon was beginning his intrigues against Ellesmere." It was in 1617 that James bestowed upon Bacon the Mace and Seals,—the very year Buckingham tried to filch them from Edgerton, (Lord Ellesmere), in order to sell them to the highest bidder. It is known that Sir John Bennet offered thirty thousand pounds for them. Neither Montague, Spedding, Abbott, nor Dixon, mention that Bacon was an enemy to Ellesmere; (quite to the contrary; they were the best of friends.) "While Bacon was torturing his fellow creatures, conniving at the death of his friends, lying, cheating, and betraying, and generally proving himself to be a cruel and pittiless monster * * * ." And yet the record is, that Lord Bacon's over-indulgence to his servants was largely the cause of his fall—one whose hand was ever

open to charity, whose heart was large enough to forgive his enemies—yea, even to love and praise them. Here is one of Lord Bacon's utterances: "It is a pleasure to stand upon the shore, and to see ships tost upon the sea; a pleasure to stand in the window of a castle, and to see a battle, and the adventures thereof below; but no pleasure is comparable to the standing upon the vantage ground of truth (a hill not to be commanded, and where the air is always clear and serene), and to see the errors, and wanderings, and mists, and tempests, in the vale below: so always that this prospect be with pity, and not with swellinig or pride."

Truly it was with pity Bacon viewed mankind, for it was his misfortune to be born in an age of barbarism—when the king was absolute and called a "God on earth!" Bishop Hall, in his Satires, says the men of his age were "beasts in life and the women beasts in heart." Mr. Peckham and Mr. Ashhurst overlook this fact, and do not either by reflection or imagination go back to the Elizabethan Age. Men were then just beginning to open their eyes, after centuries of mental blindness, and thought was still controlled by the queen, her ministers, and her bishops. We are afraid that these two astute lawyers overlook these facts, and judge Bacon from the Twentieth Century standpoint. As well believe that Bacon's intellect could purge his whole age of superstition and ignorance, as to think he could pass through such an age without being tainted by the abuses of his times. Charity and toleration breathe through all his works; but nevertheless certainly neither Mr. Peckham nor Mr. Ashhurst seem to have gone to Bacon's most careful biographer for the facts. For example, is Mr. Ashhurst within the facts when he says that Essex gave Bacon, out of pure bounty and good will, that Twickenham property? Is it not the fact that both Francis and Anthony Bacon had served Essex faithfully for years without compensation, and had earned somewhat? Twickenham Park itself was conferred on Bacon by Elizabeth. It had never been Essex's to give. (Rot. 38 Elizabeth, Pars. VI, 20, Record Office.) "The two brothers believed, and they had every reason to believe, that in entering the service of Lord Essex they would be placing themselves on the true side in politics, and in the position for most efficiently serving their country and their queen. Thus Francis became his lawyer and man of political business, Anthony his secretary and foreign correspondent. These services, occasional on the part of Francis, daily on the part of Anthony, led them into expenses which they ought to have been repaid. No salary had been fixed for Francis; Anthony was to have had a thousand pounds a year. They could never get a penny of their wages." Hepworth Dixon's

Story of Lord Bacon's Life, p. 52-53. Mr. Ashhurst says that Bacon procured the conviction of Essex. Was it not Lord Coke who was the leader for the Crown in the Essex trial? As to Bacon's part in that trial which the Queen commanded him to take, we know that Elizabeth was not to be trifled with, and had he not done what, according to the facts, was his duty to the state and to his queen, who can doubt that Bacon's own head would have very speedily rolled into the basket? Whatever King James may have been, Queen Elizabeth would not have failed to understand what Bacon's resignation (which Mr. Ashhurst suggests might have been tendered) meant. Sir Henry Yelverton had no Elizabeth to deal with when he resigned office rather than prosecute one of King James' minions. As to Bacon's authorship of "The Declaration of The Treasons of the Earl of Essex," he was commanded by the queen to write it, and after he had finished it, Elizabeth took it from him, "and with her own hand altered it so that it was almost a new writing." This is Hepworth Dixon's account of the matter:

"When law and justice were appeased, the queen commanded Bacon to draw up, for publication, a brief and simple narrative of these events. The queen, sending for him to the palace, commanded him, on hints and materials furnished by herself and members of her Privy Council, to draft such a state paper as should satisfy the world that in all the proceedings which she had taken against her guilty kinsman, law had been respected and justice done. Bacon took her materials, and wove them into a tale so much more generous to the dead Earl than just to the living queen that the Declaration sounded to her ears like an exclamation, almost an excuse for the plot. It must be mended. Pen in hand, she weighed and slashed at Bacon's words; her Privy Council did the same, until the story acquired a new form and a new sense. She bade him write out the whole afresh. When the Declaration so changed was put into type, she again sent for him. The style was too soft; the tone too lenient. 'It is my Lord of Essex, my Lord of Exxes,' she cried, 'on every page; you can't forget your old respect for the traitor; strike it out; make it Essex, or the late Earl of Essex.' She printed the whole book anew." (Story of Lord Bacon's Life, by Hepworth Dixon, 184-185.)

And this is what Lord Bacon himself said about the matter: "Whatever I did concerning that action and proceeding was done in my duty and service to the Queen and State, in which I could not show myself faint-hearted or weak-hearted for any man's sake living. For any action of mine towards him (Essex) there is nothing that passed me in my lifetime that

cometh to my remembrance with more clearness and less check of conscience: for it will appear to your Lordship that I was not only not opposite to my Lord of Essex, but that I did occupy the utmost of my wits, and adventure my fortune with the queen to have reintegrated his, and so continued faithfully and industriously, till his last fatal impatience (for so I will call it), after which day there was not time to work for him; though the same, my affection, when it could not work on the subject proper, went to the next (Southampton) with no ill effect towards some others, who, I think, do rather not know it, than acknowledge it. And this I will assure your Lordship, I will leave nothing untold, that is truth, for any enemy that I have to add; and on the other side, I must reserve much which makes for me in many respects of duty, which I esteem above my credit; and what I have here set down to your Lordship, I protest, as I hope to have any part in God's favor, is true." Are we to understand that Mr. Ashhurst concends that Lord Bacon owed a higher duty to Essex than he owed to the State? What would Mr. Ashhurst have had to say if Essex had actually been a dangerous traitor and Lord Bacon had refused to prosecute him because he (Essex) had once given him (Bacon) a piece of property? Who would have been the corrupt lawyer then? Mr. Ashhurst says: "Both Somerset and the Countess were pardoned and released, after which they retired into the country, begot children and lived and died happily." Is it not rather the fact that after the trial (as is not infrequently the case with co-criminals) the Earl and the Countess grew to loathe each other, and finally died without other children, and miserably? (Devereux, Lifes of the Earls of Essex.) "High treason is not written in Ice"—and until 1790 even women were burned at the stake for petit treason. The great lawyers of to-day do not execrate Blackstone for saying "The punishment for petit treason in a man is to be drawn and hanged, and in a woman to be burned. But because they claim, (without the slightest evidence) that Bacon, almost two centuries before Blackstone, believed in the punishment of the Question, both Mr. Ashhurst and Mr. Peckham condemn one of their own honorable profession to eternal obloquy without Benefit of Clergy.

BASIL BROWN.

235. In the Introduction to the fourth Bankside, Dr. Appleton Morgan argues that "Titus Andronicus" was Shakespeare's own work, not with any fear of Meres or of Ravenscroft before his eyes (though the testimony of even one witness who swears positively is worth more than that of any number of witnesses who swear that they know nothing about the matter before the court), or because any number of prior critics had dubbed

it his; but because, at its date, it was precisely the most lucrative and popular play that Shakespeare could have mounted—several more murders would have even assisted its popularity—because Meres stated that it was Shakespeare's—because, by common consent it was announced and discussed as his—because it was played by Shakespeare's Company, upon Shakespeare's boards, and because, in accord with Shakespeare's tendency, it follows classical forms, and is located (as his tragedies largely were) in classic times; because it is careless—as Shakespeare always was, about Anachronism, and because it was deliberately placed in the first folio by Blount, Jaggard, Aspley and Smithweeke. Other reasons were, that no other author claimed it, that it was printed three times in Quarto by a publisher who was in the habit of printing Shakespeare's plays—and finally, because it abounds in the Shakespeare habitude of inserting episodic poetry when no situation or necessity of the action called. for, or even justified it; poetry—by the way—such as nobody but Shakespeare wrote (even though others might have used identical words—and the book we are reviewing lays mighty stress upon identical words!) That the resemblances, pictorial phaseologies (in several cases in all but identical phrases, and in one case at least a practically identical phrase: "She is a woman therefore to be woed," etc.), while the preponderance of the play is in Marloweian blank verse (though Dr. Morgan assumes to care very little for verse details, holding that Shakespeare did not consult his almanac as to what prosodies were due from his pen at a given time—but was master of any number of prosodies and used them as he pleased!)—gave the direct non-sequitur to the verse-testers who claimed that Shakespeare's earlier work must be in rhymed lines!—(a lucus a non-lucendo such as Dr. Morgan delights to detect in criticism!) We doubt whether Mr. Robertson's two hundred and fifty-five pages of strained and minute anaylsis will exactly dumfound and confound Dr. Morgan and all his school as it ought! Mr. Robertson prepares himself for his ultimatum—which may be stated thus—"that Shakespeare had less to do with Titus Andronicus than anybody else, if there were more than one author of it—and nothing at all to do with it if there were but one author of it," by an elaborate word to word conference of the contemporary plays not definitely assignable to any one playwright, but more or less conjecturally awarded to Marlowe, Kyd, Lodge, Green and even sent so far afield as Kyd—such plays as Arden of Feversham, Soliman and Persida—Locrine—Leir, Alphonsius of Germany, Sir Clyomon, or the almost, if not altogether, Shakespearean Edward the Third, with the Titus Andronicus. Mr. Robertson is not one of the critics

who demands circumstantial evidence, if only there is internal evidence at hand to forge ahead with, and his result is that any one who might have written any one of these plays might be convicted at the cannon-mouth of writing Titus Andronicus! Dr. Morgan did not see why circumstantial evidence should be the monopoly of Baconians, and in his reactional study "The Shakespearean Myth—or William Shakespeare and circumstantial evidence"—taught us that we of the orthodox camp could also cite Scripture to our purpose.) And in this Mr. Robertson agrees with Dr. Morgan. He therefore admits evidence that this play was performed at least as often by other manager's companies as it was by Shakespeare's—and that three of the Quarto Editions of it did not bear Shakespeare's name on the title page. But he guilelessly argues against the circumstantial evidence which is strongest of all in his own favor, and urges the carelessness with which everything with which Shakespeare's name was ever connected was launched into print. A carelessness which he cannot discover elsewhere when it happens to work against his theory, however, Dr. Morgan (who—however he evades the tendency—could not get himself disentangled from destructive criticism) was himself the first to show that Venus and Adonis—"The first heir of Shakespeare's invention"—(that is, perhaps his first poem)—contained not the scintilla of the shadow of a shade of Warwickshire Dialect or atmosphere—although Shakespeare at its date was very recently a Stratfordian, to whom a bit of London English or a smell of the sea coast would have been as unaccustomed as wheat-fields in polar zones! that the sonnets were issued with two verses in one of them deliberately supplied by brackets (the 126th) and the second line in one of the (the 146th) made up—out of quantity by a repetitive of the preceeding line—and that the Passionate Pilgrim was made up out of desultory stanzas from various authors, among them actually even some of Shakespeare's own connected work—(as if Lord Tennyson had published a collection of contemporary verse and run in a few random stanzas of "In Memoriam." How then could Dr. Morgan be appealed to by so slight a matter on the omission of an author's name on a title page when any publisher could put any name he pleased—or leave any off of any title page he pleased—beyond the power of author of authority to forbid? But, when Dr. Morgan did come to the internal evidence we think he made point for Shakespeare—that even Mr. Robertson does not produce—Titus's apostrophe to the grave: "Here lurk no treasons, here no envy swells—here grow no damned grudges"—Tamora's apostrophe to her own prospects which she compares to the sun overcoming the

darkness the day dawn. "Now climbeth Tamora olympus' top," etc., the sotto voce "more water glideth by the mill than wots the miller of," the line—"King be thy thoughts imperious as thy name. Is the sun dimmed that gnats do fly in it?" the couplet mentioned above: "She is a woman therefore to be woed. She is a woman therefore to be won—and Richard's —"was ere a woman in this humour woed—was ever woman in this humour won"—seen to this writer very faintly offset by Mr. Robertson's comparison of lines in Titus to lines in Greene or his compeers! These are many. But in this business all men's ears are not trained alike—one man may see that the verses "The Imperial seat to virtue consecrate" (Titus Andronicus I. i. 14.) "To Virtue and to Vesta consecrate" (Polyhymnia 280.) "In deed to fame and virtue consecrate" (Honour of the Garter) prove one thing. Another that they prove another thing—another that they prove nothing! Another remarks—not without reason—that what a critic discovers in Shakespeare depends largely upon what it is that he sets himself out to find therein! But, however, this may be, no one can fail to find his respect challenged by Mr. Robertson's evident good faith and purpose to be fair with his reader, to avoid sweeping statements—to find every goose a swan (though we cannot add: and every trifle light as air a confirmation strong as Holy Writ!) He sums up his own conclusions in this way— "The probability is that between 1590 and 1592 Greene revised or expanded an earlier play, in which Peele had already a large share; but there is the alternative possibility that Peele revised an old play by Greene and by Kyd. The fresh matter or revision which in 1594, caused the play to figure as new, may, again, have been by Peele or by Kyd, or by Lodge. But the amount contributed by either of the last two named to the present play is small, though it is somewhat likely that Kyd had a hand earlier in shaping the plot. There is abundant proof that Elizabethan plays were in this way frequently recast, and that Peele and Green in particular frequently corroborated or eked out, each other's plays. The argument from alleged internal evidence breaks down at every point, the proposed tests invariably recoiling against the thesis. There is no more evidence of structural revision or amendment by Shakespeare in Titus than in Locrine. Any revision Shakespeare gave it appears to have been limited to the making the lines scan—and even this is not carefully done." This last clause frankly seems to us an extremely nascitur ridiculus mus for such a parturiunt montes. Two hundred and fifty pages twelve mo., of ten point type, and only that somebody did something and Shakespeare "made it scan!" If Mr. Robertson had said that Shakespeare drove a

coach-and-six through the scanson as he did through the unities, in order to make a better play of it, or to pack in—or to take out—a few murders, or to do what he knew his audiences wanted in a play, it would have been vastly more likely! After such a verdict we do not see that much more is to be said to show the reader what this book is like. But we might add that, even admitting that the metrical testa prove all that Mr. Robertson wants them to prove, they do not prove enough to disturb a proposition which anybody on external or internal evidence aliunde has established! The citations are too confined—the averages are not controlling enough to be even suggestive. In a play of two thousand five hundred and sixty-one lines (Bankside notation of the first quarto) one feminine line to twenty or to forty might mean something or nothing. But to show fifteen feminine lines in two thousand five hundred and sixty (we are giving these numbers for example only—) seems to this writer not to prove whatever such a proposition is marshalled to prove—whatever it is! Why deny to Virgil what any Bathyllus could have produced? Why deny to Shakespeare what would be nothing for any school boy to manage? And, finally, Mr. Robertson who neglects nothing—has counted the hapax legomena in all the authors concerned, and finds twenty-three in all Peele's writings that are in Titus Andronicus alone, Twenty-three! when Dr. James Davie Butler (papers of the New Shakespeare Society, No. V-VI, 1886) has told us that Shakespeare's plays alone contain between six and seven thousand once-used words, and that in the very first line he might ever have written—the first line in Venus and Adonis "Even as the sun with purple-coloured face," a word (the compound "purple coloured") is used once—and discarded forever! And what theory is yet to burst upon a startled world from Mr. Robertson's discovery (page 83) that "ruthless," "Empery," "Entrails," "Phoebe," "coalback," occur not only respectively twice, thrice, twice, once and thrice in Titus, and "frequently in Peele!" whereas they are "common in the Henry VI group, but only once or seldom found in genuine works." It seems to us nothing but letting empty buckets into empty wells and growing old in drawing nothing up! Briefly, Mr. Robertson's book is an elaborate tour de force! Whatever the state of the question was when he took it up—just there that question hovers now that he has written his book! But this is not to damn Mr. Robertson's book. Only as to its lame and impotent conclusion, is at a failure. To a student of that formative and more or less adumbrative period of the English drama with which it concerns itself, it should be an indispensible part of his reference library.

P. A. LAING.

236. It would be a real misfortune if the Misses Porter and Clarke should relax their editorial circumspection in their "First Folio Edition" of the Plays—of which we have spoken so highly—and for which—perhaps we have been taught by its excellence to expect still more—instead of still less—excellence as it goes on. The last play, "Twelve Night," appears with an Introduction beginning, "Seeing Twelfe Night, carefully acted as a whole recently by Sothern and Marlowe, instead of fractionally and carelessly, as is more common, a new light was flashed out of it upon the covert puritanism of the play." As "Sothern and Marlowe" were playing Shakespearean parts when this left the press, it would seem to partake too much of, as it is called, we believe, "the age of advertising." Messrs. Porter and Clarke should not forget that they are (at least we hope they are) editing a work for all Times—and highly as we think of Mr. Sothern and Miss Marlowe, the "new light" seems a little out of place. This number preserves all the features, of course, of this admirable edition, which we have so often fully described and commended. The suggestion of complimentary orders (perhaps proscenium box) is bad enough. But is even the Porter Clarke combination to yield to the temptation to finding symbolism of current matters in those players' lines of three hundred years ago? (Perhaps the actors in a Pinero play to-morrow night will be uttering symbolisms of something or other to be current three centuries beyond us. Quien sabe!) "By dint of being true to life at a definite time, it is a tell-tale of the lurking symptoms." One group of characters, Sir Toby, Aguecheek, Maria, the Clown Fabian, represents "the gross, yet shrewd and healthy, popular life" of that day; the other, including Viola and Sebastian, Orsino, Olivia, and "that valiant heart of the high seas, Antonio," represents "the artistic and scholarly, yet indigenous life of the part of Shakespeare's England that responded to the throbbing voice of the Italian Renaissance." Between the two groups stands Malvolio, who by saying "I'll be revenged on the pack of you," symbolizes that both cults will ultimately disappear!!! When the Porter Clarkes come to edit the Sonnets we expect that the lovely Boy will be The Divine Logos, and "The Dark Lady," Mrs. Baker G. Eddy!

256. Mr. Bormann has gone beyond his intellect. This is his peculiar thesis—to wit: In Bacon's Will is this passage "Legacies to my friends." I give unto the right honorable my worthy friend the Marquis Fiatt, late Lord Ambassador of France, my book of Visions or Psalms curiously rhymed. Would it be credited to sanity that Mr. Borman claims that the Shakespeare Plays are these "Psalms curiously rhymed?" Or that the

proof of this whimsical propositus is that—by distorting—or fantastically printing certain passages in the Plays—they can be so arranged as to "curiously rhyme?" Vidilecet, the line: "I, but to die and go we know not where! to lie in cold obstruction and to rot. Dislocated this reads." I | But to die | and go | we know | not where,—to lie | in cold obstruction and to rot! | We congratulate the publishers, Messrs. Siegle, Hill & Co., upon their bookmaking!

244. This is a beautiful gift-book. It is bound in gold and gules, severely elegant, and contains twelve full page pictures in sepia of the present, or latest available condition of those actual precincts where Shakespeare placed the action of a play. Thus, the Rome of "Julius Cæsar," Egypt in the time of "Antony and Cleopatra," the Verona of "Romeo and Juliet"; Pauda, the scene of "The Taming of the Shrew"; the place where "The Merchant of Venice" traded, the localities where Desdemona lived and died, ("Othello,") several of the castles of "Macbeth," Kronborg Castle at Elsinore, where Hamlet, the Jutland Prince, was transplanted; the setting for "A Midsummer Night's Dream"; Windsor Park and town, where were located "The Merry Wives of Windsor"; the London of "Richard III," and the haunts of Henry the Eighth. The letter-press description—while not academic, or intended for students, is familiar and sufficiently descriptive.

246. Whenever again the outworn story of the lawyer who procured the acquittal of his client for sheep-stealing, by instructing him on the trial to say nothing but "baa-aa," and who on demanding his fee got nothing but that response from his acquitted client, let the rider be added that the tale dates from the year 1469. The earliest French Comedy (ante-dating Moliere.) The Farce of Master Pierre Patelin, has for its principal character a starving lawyer named Pierre Patelin. His wife clamours for a dress and he himself needs a suit of clothes. Neither have a sou, but nevertheless Pierre tells his wife that he will go and fetch the cloth for both. He goes to a draper and orders the best in his shop, and by flattering him and inviting him to dinner when he is to get the gold, gets possession of the cloth. When the draper comes to dinner he finds the wife weeping for her husband is a raving maniac and the draper runs for his life. This same draper, by the way, is the man from whom the lawyer's sheep- stealing client has stolen the sheep! In court the draper is so full of complaint, not only for his lost sheep, but his lost cloth, that Pierre has little difficulty in so mixing up his complaints about the cloth with his complaint about the sheep, and so calls attention of the Court to the fact

that the Plaintiff don't know whether he has lost a sheep or a quantity of cloth, that the Court puts the poor Draper out of court on both counts. So Pierre as well as the client is cleared. Then comes the attempt to collect the fee. This is a clever regard of the unities, and a sprightly farce that would do no discredit to a farce writer to-day. It is certainly the most interesting discovery lately made in stage history. And the Riverside Press have done Dramatic students a great service by printing it.

251. Why a novel, whatever its vogue in book form, is most usually a failure when dramatised, is supposed to be parabolic. And yet it is the simplest of propositions—as simple as that a play in five acts is not a novel in five chapters. Perhaps to illustrate this Mr. Bronson Howard has written a novel in five chapters, "Kate," which is really a Comedy in five acts. For "chapters," he uses the word "Acts," but he dispenses with the names of the speakers entirely. (Actors on the stage are not labelled, says Mr. Howard in his Preface, with a suggestion that if an author cannot identify his characters by their speeches, he is not much of an author.) We have never met a more delightful study. And the reader will perceive as he follows it, how every speech placed in the mouth of an actor on a stage would advance the action of the story itself—to its catastrophe and consummation. If Mr. Howard wrote novels to be dramatized, or plays to be novellized, he would be the success in both that he has been always as a dramatist—the Dean of American Dramatists as we have grown used to hearing him affectionately called.

***The Editors cannot undertake to return unused manuscript, though they will endeavor to do so if self-directed, stamped envelope is enclosed therewith.

All manuscripts submitted *must be type-written.*

Address all matters intended for The Editors, Books for Review, etc., NEW SHAKESPEAREANA, P. O. Box, 617, WESTFIELD, NEW JERSEY.